

some eminent eugenists argue in favour, not only of perpetuating, but of increasing economic disparities between classes. If, as they allege, superior classes are really superior why should they fear equality of environment and opportunity?

C. N. FREEMAN.

35, Dagenham Avenue,
Dagenham, Essex.

Legalizing Sterilization

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I am still unconvinced that if a Bill be passed legalizing voluntary eugenic sterilization it will not by implication make all voluntary sterilization, other than therapeutic and eugenic, illegal. Therefore, as I strongly believe that the people of the poorest classes should be encouraged to beget very small families by having also this method of birth control made freely available to them, I have continued to urge that the *Eugenics Society's* policy should be to legalize voluntary sterilization and not merely voluntary eugenic sterilization. But the objection is being raised that if all voluntary sterilization were made legal there would be abuse of this—unscrupulous surgeons could be adequately bribed by young, healthy, childless persons to sterilize them. If the *Society* really considers this to be a valid objection, I suggest that voluntary sterilization be made legal only for persons who have at least two children, unless the persons be certified defectives. Similarly, by another Bill, medical practitioners might well be made at least free to accede to a request for an abortion from any woman who has two or more children, especially in view of the discovery in Germany that a certain ointment injected into the gravid uterus gives very satisfactory results at any stage. As to an allegation of some deaths from it among the thousands of cases, the President of the Medico-Legal Society stated at its recent discussion on abortion that evidence he had managed to get was that they were possibly due to other causes.

B. DUNLOP, M.B.

Eugenics and Socialism

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—Mr. Allaun wants to muster the Socialists into the Eugenic fold, and blames the Eugenists for keeping them out.

"The majority of reformers are Socialists," he declares, and believes that because both Socialists and Eugenists consider themselves reformers the former would be both a possible and a desirable addition to the ranks of the Eugenists. But what assistance can two travelers give each other who are determined to travel to a common goal by different routes and also

differ as to the location of that goal? Mr. Allaun declares that, "Eugenics is as necessary in the Socialist as in the Capitalist State," but this, though probably an understatement of the truth, makes a poor appeal to cupidity in a hurry. He instances Russia as both eugenic and socialist. But Russia has gone back on Socialism. Mr. Allaun's well-intentioned attempt to reconcile irreconcilables naturally lands him in difficulties.

"Eugenics recognizes class differences, but the classes are of ability, not of wealth!" As though ability were not wealth! "Lack of capital does not denote lack of mental and physical qualities." Assuming that the mental and physical qualities are also desirable, are they not a portion of their owner's capital? They are not always capable of being turned into cash at any particular moment, but that is true of many other forms of capital. The assumption that "capital" means cash and cash only is troublesome. Anything that can be loaned, sold or hired as opportunity offers and before it's owner's death should be regarded as his capital, though possibly "frozen." Many say, "It's better to be born lucky than rich," i.e. they think inherited mental and physical capital better than cash capital. The popular saying, "The working-man's wages are his only capital," contradicts the fact that wages are interest and not capital. The working-man's capital (apart from clothes, tools, etc.) is his mind and his body; and his wages (if any) are interest thereon. If he is clever enough to invest his capital successfully, he resembles one who is clever enough to invest cash successfully. The difference in outlook between Socialists and Eugenists is fundamental. The Socialist is first and foremost an environmentalist. The Eugenist upholds the importance of heredity, and thinks that environment has received too much attention *relatively*, and with bad results to mankind. The Eugenist and the Socialist agree only in dissatisfaction with the *status quo*. For its miseries the Socialist blames a part of our environment, and the Eugenist (chiefly) a part of our heredity. "The kingdoms of Heaven and Hell are largely within us," says the Eugenist. The Socialist believes them to be outside himself and located in finance. The Eugenist says, "We must be born again in our children, but only if we can be born better suited to our environment. Can we gather grapes of thistles?" The Socialist favours rather Omar Khayyam, and would shatter and remould nearer to his heart's desire not himself but a part of his environment. Mr. Allaun writes as though there is little connection between money and ability. Let him test it by taking a long voyage first-class and returning third. Or by living a month in the most expensive hotel in any town and a month in the cheapest. He criticizes "the talented and aristocratic members of the (Euge-

tics) *Society*, and I am afraid that many regard the *Society* as one for mutual admiration. Actually, I know nothing more likely to influence a man towards eugenics than frank admission of his own inherited defects, or towards Socialism than a tendency to blame anybody else rather than himself and his ancestry.

GUY PORTER.

Mahara,
Upper King's Cliff,
Jersey.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I thank Mr. Porter for his letter because it gives me the opportunity of further explaining my position.

Suffering is the result of two factors—heredity and environment. Pain and disease being undesirable, I am, respectively, a eugenicist and a socialist. To my dismay I find the former attacking the latter. My quarrel with Mr. Porter and the *Society* is that they maintain differential

ability as a justification of our disgusting economic system with its intensifying trade cycle and imperialist warfare.

My communist friends do *not* hold that all men are born equal. Several strongly support sexual and eugenic reform, although doubting its possibility in a world organized and producing only for profit. They would answer Mr. Porter's contention that wealth represents worth by showing how 5 per cent. of our population owns 60 per cent. of the national wealth! Is the Welsh miner or Lancashire weaver worth less than £2 a week?

He rightly accuses me of attempting to reconcile the two reforms. If we add a third, internationalism, we have the great movements which include all other social improvements. In my opinion these three roads converge in Utopia on the horizon.

F. J. ALLAUN.

10, Wilmslow Road,
Didsbury,
Manchester.

